THEOLOGY

VOL. LXI MARCH, 1958 No. 453

Editorial

A YEAR or two ago a writer in a Sunday newspaper remarked that "in this country, a theologian is regarded in the same light as an astronomer or a professional bird-watcher—someone whose concerns have nothing to do with persons more gainfully employed".[1] It was evidently said more in sadness than in sarcasm. The professors of any discipline need periodically, if not constantly, to be engaged in self-criticism and to give heed to what their disappointed well-wishers from without have to say to them. Mr J. P. Corbett in a recent broadcast talk on "How to be an agnostic"[2] said much to the point and said it extremely well. "Believers in religion," he said, "have lost the capacity, and seem even to have lost the will, to speak with candour and effect to those who live outside their faith. . . . They have not crossed the road of time to face and struggle with the needs of men who live in modern societies like ours; they have gone on walking, very decorously, down the other side." That he speaks as a friend, and as a discerning one, is clear from what he went on to say: "We must . . . seek out the true substance of religious experience and religious thought, the true substance whose dim but powerful presence to our minds makes it impossible for us to turn our backs upon the world of faith, the true substance which has been dressed out, to meet the needs of earlier societies, in forms which are intolerable to ours."

In spite of all our talk about "the problem of communication" and about "demythologizing" he would be a bold man who claimed that theologians as a class have yet faced the magnitude of the task that lies before them. The articles in this number are designed to rub our noses in it. Until we can say more definitely what theologians ought to be doing and aiming at in this age of the world, we shall not escape from the air of archaism that hangs over theological faculties in universities where presumably some sort of a break-through should be made. It might of course be the case that theologians were manfully keeping alight a torch to which the rest of the world, at present in the dark, will eventually return for illumination. But we are sure that this is too simple and complacent a view of the situation. Theology must be prepared to move and change and travel, and we shall not be able to see the end from the beginning.

Let us hear more of what Mr Corbett has to say to us: "Jesus spoke to men who fished, who sowed and reaped by hand, who tended the olive and the vine; men to whom disease and poverty were unalter-

[1] *The Observer*, 8 July 1956.
[2] Published in *The Listener*, 9 January 1958.

the curriculum at all. But it is hardly in order to bring them under a theological critique that they are brought into the syllabus.)

This close identification of theology with expertise and training is assisted in the hold it has on people's minds by what is going on in almost every sphere. Everybody nowadays has to be a specialist in something. The parson, whose very name meant just "the person", the representative man, is an odd-man-out in all this. So he must have his expertise: let it be theology: for, after all, has he not been to a "theological college"? This causes us to forget that some things cannot be turned into expertise: that education is different from training at the point where it is concerned with growth into and not knowledge *of*. By constantly asking what theology is *for*, what is the good of it, what results it has in terms of the men who come out of theological colleges, we silence the far more fundamental question "What *is* theology?" We therefore confuse two things: *growth into* some capacity to think theologically, and *knowledge of* the results of other people's theological or historical studies.

Teachers of theology would scarcely deny that their students leave their hands with more knowledge about theology than they have capacity to think theologically. Knowledge about theology is far easier to acquire and it is eminently examinable. The capacity to think in a genuinely theological way about life in the world, about God and his present acts demands a continuous effort to relate beliefs and knowledge to experience; it is highly unexaminable. I suppose it has always been an implicit assumption that one reason for teaching theology to the ministry was that they should instruct the laity. The theological teachers instruct the ordinands who, when ordained, mount their pulpits or organize their study groups and pass on the substance or the conclusions of what they have learned, and have been exhorted to go on studying, to the laity. But this working hypothesis does not now work, in spite of all we say about a teaching ministry. Sermons, on the whole, contain far more ethics, exhortation and anecdote than they do theological or biblical teaching: this is not only a general impression but the particular observation of a research worker who took down 200 sermons in shorthand in the churches of all denominations in two towns. Far from blaming clergy and ministers one ought perhaps to praise their realism: they are right when they declare that their people regard theology as academic study, remote from their lives, and honest when they admit that much of what they learned in theological colleges rusts away from lack of use. The analogy of theology with medicine as expertise breaks down at the point of our admission that the working parson does not make the same day-to-day use of his expertise that the doctor makes of his, nor does he feel the same pressure to keep abreast of developments in it.

This raises two questions. The first is historical. Has the hypothesis of an instructed ministry teaching theological knowledge and insight to a receptive laity *ever* worked? The Eastern Churches have always maintained a direct link between theology and laity; many of their theologians and theological teachers have been, and still are,

laity. In the West, while it is true that the clergy were the clerks, the laity have over and over again paid more attention to popular preachers (orthodox or heretical), friars and others than to those whom they regarded as more distant from themselves. We are staggered, when we read them, by the length and weight of the sermons preached to many post-Reformation congregations: but these were not exercises in communication to the theologically illiterate. The great sermons were preached to congregations nourished on the private reading of the Bible, and many of the members of them gained from that reading not only practical guidance in the making of decisions, small and great, in their own lives, but an outlook on man and the world which could properly be called theological, and this they gained not by spoon-feeding but by their own endeavours.

The second question reverts to the opening remarks about ecology. Where is the real growing-place for theology to-day? In the university? In the Church? Or somewhere else? Where can we see what theology is?

I believe we can begin to answer this second and far more important question by turning aside from questions about the relation of theology to the clergy, which have become so largely questions of the training of the ministry, and turning our attention to what is happening to the laity, i.e. to 99 per cent of the Church. The modern layman lives in two worlds, and is becoming more and more conscious of this fact. He lives in the Church where he worships, receives the sacraments and joins in Christian fellowship, and where a language is spoken which is directly derived from the Bible. The rest of the week he spends in a world becoming dominated more and more by conceptions and ideas which are far from being Christian or even religious. They are not essentially or deliberately anti-religious either: they just don't connect with religion at any obvious point. Everywhere the Christian meets and participates in what is, with all its defects, a vast human achievement, which is, through science and technology, making a new world, physically and mentally. This achievement is a collective one, based on shared knowledge and common responses. It acknowledges no debt to religion, history or tradition.[1] Christians (especially those who have nothing to do with science or technology) may decry its *hubris*, but it is characterized by something like a deep humility and by a moral passion of its own. "God is teaching us," said Bonhoeffer, "that we must live as men who can get along very well without him."

The Christian stands in a peculiar position vis-à-vis this new culture which is so rapidly becoming universal. He is a child of it, committed to it by daily living, one with it in many attitudes which already lie at too deep a level of consciousness for repudiation. When he is challenged, part of his mind is with the challengers. In a sense it is true, as the critics say, that he is keeping alive old ideas and fears which make life more complicated. It is true that many of the things that Christians traditionally care for are manifested "with

[1] See Guardini, *The End of the Modern World.*

power" in the technological society, where the poor are fed, taught and healed as never before. It is not easy to be a witness, except in marginal things; to claim to manifest a better way of life gets one labelled a prig, or worse. Even behind the Iron Curtain, where one can become a martyr, there is still the narking doubt whether one is, in a particular instance, witnessing to Christ's kingdom or to the right not to move with the times.

The easiest way out for the Christian puzzled by the two worlds, or accepting them as unrelated without much concern, is to identify his Christian life with his Church life. The Church becomes to him, and he in turn makes the Church, a little world of its own, engrossing in all its detail. Not only does the institution and its activities absorb attention: certain trends within theology itself can intensify absorption in the Church. The very work for Christian unity fastens theological attention on questions of Church order and much of the discussion of the doctrine of the Church is in fact discussion of part of the Church, namely the ordained ministry, because this is what is in debate between the Churches. Nobody would want to suggest that the Church is windowless towards the world. The Church does look out on the world of suffering humanity and gives, by human comparisons, lavishly in money and service. The Church also looks out through a window of missions and evangelism and through Christian social organizations. Those windows have all become traditional in the Church, an accepted part of what most Christians think of as "the organized Church". But where the Church presents an almost blank wall is towards that which is becoming—one might even say has become—the culture of our time. It is about 1,500 years since the Church in the West lived in a mainly non-Christian culture, and small wonder if it has grown out of practice! The question is too often turned into one of evangelistic tactics or effective organization, but fundamentally it is an intellectual question, a theological question, and needs, surely, as great a theological effort as was sustained by the Church in the Graeco-Roman world. In spite of a few shining lights, we are a long way from that. Are we perhaps in the total balance of what constitutes "theology" both written and taught, overweighted on the side of historical and critical studies? Is it not true that to many of our non-Christian contemporaries, Christianity is something belonging to past ages, a creative intellectual activity once, but now a repetition as history of what was once contemporary?

What to do? The trends of years cannot be reversed in months, but at least a beginning can be made sorting out some priorities.

(1) Theological thought about the Church as an institution needs correction and supplementation by giving theological depth to the idea now growing in many quarters that the Church exists through the persons of its members within their vocation, profession, work place and organization of secular society. We think institutionally and functionally about the meaning of "laity" but not theologically. We need to ponder on the theological significance of the persons of the Church interpenetrating the secular world. Far too many Chris-

tians think that the Church on churchly occasions is the Church and think of the Christian's life in the world not as part of the Church's life, but as an individual performance. We need also a theological exploration of the question whether the clergy are not also laity when the Church is regarded in its outward going aspect as "the people of God in the world". Such a view is not necessarily inconsistent with very strict views of the sacredness and uniqueness of the Christian ministry.

(2) It is not good enough that the laity should sit back and ask the theologians or the clergy or somebody else to provide them with a Christian understanding of the secular culture within which they live. It is the laity who know in detail as a matter of experience what this secular culture is like, and far from suppressing thought of it as they enter the Church they should realize that it is their experience and knowledge which is the raw material for a theological reflection on the contemporary world. It is also proper to ask those Christian laymen who take an interest in theological matters whether they are directing that interest in the right quarter; i.e. whether they are seeking by hard thought and reading to cultivate a theological outlook on their own experience in the contemporary world or whether they are greatly enjoying collecting little bits of the theological expertise of the clergy.

(3) Thirdly, wings might be given to our heels in these matters if more Christians were more acutely aware of the seriousness of the present situation. It is useless to derive false comfort from a prevailing respect in our society for the Christian ethic, from such phenomena as the packed churches of the United States. Every culture has its formative élite. The closer one comes to that élite in the new culture of the West, the more one is conscious of its non-religious character. "Can the faith survive?" is not a rhetorical question, and may depend on a transplanted theology putting down its roots in the land where the layman lives.

KATHLEEN BLISS.

Theology in the Modern Universities

THE study of theology is a comparatively new development in the "modern" Universities. This statement requires some modification in the cases of Manchester and, of course, of the Durham division of Durham; it should also be added that in some of the newest universities biblical and theological studies are still in a very rudimentary state. Only Liverpool, where theology is still forbidden, has been unable to free itself from the *hereditas damnosa* of Victorian progressivism, though elsewhere also the latter has taken a long time a-dying. Theological departments in all universities, ancient and modern, tend to be encumbered with the ideological inhibitions of the period in which those departments were first established. One is tempted to exclaim, "Blessed are the theological departments still unborn, for they have no history!" It is notoriously difficult to alter

or re-style a curriculum which has been in operation for a number of years. Departments—an ugly word, but in most of the modern universities they are not faculties—which originated half a century or more ago tend to be schools of "historical" theology and nothing more: theology, like history, must be treated "scientifically", and all personal points of view must be excluded like an infection. Doctrine is dangerously denominational, and, if dealt with at all, must be handled only historically and not as a living issue. One may spend hours in discussing what Athanasius or Luther actually said, but not whether they were right in saying it. The latter question is not "science" but private opinion. Hence strange situations have arisen: a university might have full degree courses in Hebrew and the Old Testament, but not in the New Testament; or again, the finals examination might include a compulsory doctrine paper, but no lecturer in that subject could be appointed by the university. Needless to say, the conceit of "historical theology" is now being everywhere abandoned, and a broader conception of the nature and function of theological study in a university is winning general acceptance.

This newer and broader conception may be designated by the word "ecumenical". The birth of the ecumenical attitude is the most significant religious happening of our century, and it is not too much to say that one of its fruits has been to render possible living theological study in the "open" university. The rôle of the Student Christian Movement in the achievement of this result cannot be overemphasized. The Victorian exclusion of theology from the modern universities had been as much a protest against the arrogant and bitter denominationalism of the period as it had been the affirmation of a humanistic creed. To-day it has been seen that the antidote to sectarianism is not an undenominational "historical theology" or "comparative study of religion" but a genuinely interdenominational or ecumenical enterprise in which every member of a university theological department, whether teacher or student, is encouraged to be what he is and to say what he thinks. Instead of a theological course in which the discussion of living issues in theology is studiously avoided, every question of historical theology is discussed in relation to its bearing upon the life and faith of the churches to-day. In this way the sense of frustration and irrelevance, suffered by many who studied in the old schools of "historical theology" twenty or more years ago, is replaced by a new and keen awareness of the bearing even of matters which seem "purely academic" upon the vital issues confronting thoughtful people, whether Christian or not, in these days. Teaching and learning come alive in lecture-room or seminar, when both teacher and student have thrown away the fiction of being undenominational and are consciously engaged in a "traffic in knowledge". Such ecumenical encounter is nothing less than a co-operative process of agreeing and disagreeing with one another, so that each comes to understand what he himself thinks because he has been forced to articulate his belief in the face of a personal challenge. What happens in practice is that the student gains a new sense

of the value of his own tradition, as well as an awareness of the value of traditions other than his own.

The shift from the "undenominational" to the "ecumenical" emphasis leads inevitably to a broadening of the syllabuses of study. It is not, of course, that the rigorous pursuit of historical theology is in any way abated, or that anyone supposes that a solid foundation of "scientific" (critical, philological, archaeological, historical, etc.) knowledge need not be acquired by every candidate for a theological degree. But it is recognized that other matters are important also. Living questions of revelation and reason, of inspiration and authority, of liturgy and society, of science and ethics, of literature and art, are seen to be involved in theological thinking and learning. A first-class honours man must possess not merely a brilliant memory for variant readings in ancient texts but also an aptitude for discussing intelligently (say) the verification-principle of empiricist philosophy or the expression of Christian social attitudes in appropriate liturgical forms. In other words, more space must be found in the curriculum for other aspects of theological thinking than those of literary and historical criticism, and especially for apologetics (the articulation of religious truth in a scientific age), dogmatics (not merely the history of doctrine to A.D. 461, but living questions such as what we believe about the person of Christ to-day), ethics (especially in its social and political aspects) and liturgy (with special attention to the question of worship within the university community itself). If in the modern universities theological studies are still too one-sidedly literary and historical, this is probably due to the fact that many of those who planned the original syllabuses were themselves trained in the school of historical theology in Oxford, or, in some cases, its counterparts at Cambridge and Durham; they naturally tended to reproduce the system under which they had themselves grown up. It is clear that a much higher proportion of dogmatic and philosophical theology—such, in fact, as has always been included in the B.D. courses of the Scottish universities—is desirable in the situation of the modern universities.

A new factor in that situation to-day underlines this assertion. The theological honours courses of the Oxford-Cambridge-Durham type were planned on the assumption that the undergraduates who took them would all be ordinands, subsequently proceeding to a theological college for a further two years: doctrine and worship could safely be postponed until then. The modern universities, however, must provide courses for those who are *not* going on to a theological college, especially for the increasing number of both men and women who intend to become scripture specialists in grammar schools. Besides these there are a few others reading theology who intend to enter the civil services, industry (e.g. personnel and welfare departments) and social work; it seems possible that this number will increase, if the right kind of theological courses are provided at the universities. The stream of non-ordinand theological students is bound to swell considerably in the coming years. There is a desperate shortage of qualified graduate divinity teachers in the schools, a

shortage almost comparable to that of science teachers. And there is happily every year an increasing number of applicants (especially from the girls' schools) for the available places in the theological departments of the modern universities; it is much to be hoped that some of the newest of the latter will press on rapidly with the development of theological departments and that they will fashion their courses along the appropriate lines. A course which is exclusively linguistic and historico-critical does not meet the needs of such students; they must be equipped, within the limits of a three-year honours course, with all that they will need in the spheres of apologetics, philosophy, doctrine and liturgy. Opinion will vary about such questions as how much Hebrew they should learn; there is plenty of room for diversity of practice and for experimentation. Those who have come up the science side of their school should be welcomed and enabled to grapple with questions of the history and philosophy of science; a course should be provided which will do something more for them than turn them into indifferent students of the dead languages. In planning courses of study it must above all things be borne in mind that, unless the non-ordinand theological student is introduced to the study of apologetics and philosophy, doctrine and liturgy, in his university course, he (or at present more probably she) will never receive any sound teaching upon these matters at all. Neither the Ministry of Education nor the schools themselves want specialists in textual or higher criticism as such; they are looking for divinity teachers who know something about the implications of biblical truth for the worlds of literature and science, of art and industry, and for the realities of everyday living. It is not yet widely recognized what a far-reaching effect the 1944 Education Act is likely to have upon theological studies in the universities and upon theological education generally throughout the country. It would seem that in the future a new type of lay theologian, a graduate of a modern university, is likely to be found up and down the country; such a development may perhaps do something to compensate for the decline of theological learning amongst the clergy. Perhaps the theological expert in town and country in the future will be the local headmistress or the divinity specialist of the nearby grammar school rather than the busy parish priest. However that may be, the training of lay theologians is clearly an issue of momentous proportions, since they will be the decisive factor in the religious education of future generations of the English people.

It must not be supposed, however, that the number of ordinands reading theology at the modern universities is negligible. In some honours schools the ordinands outnumber the others by a considerable margin. Nevertheless, it is true to say that by and large the Church is not making full use of the facilities which the modern universities provide. This is the more surprising when it is recalled what an immense financial burden the Church is carrying in the matter of theological education. Church people generally do not yet seem to have realized that the State (through well-known mechanisms which need not here be described) is generously willing to provide

the basic theological education of ordinands at no cost whatever to the Church or to the ordinands. Of course, there are problems of adjustment in relation to the present set-up of the theological colleges; but these could doubtless be solved if Church authorities responsible for training for the ministry saw clearly what those problems were. It needs to be asked again what kind of theological course is best suited to the student who has already obtained an honours degree in theology in a modern university and whether it needs to last for two further years. The problem does not so much concern the first class honours man, or even the upper second; they can look after themselves and perhaps study for a higher degree in their own university. It concerns rather the lower second and third class honours men; they have (we must insist) good degrees; they have successfully completed a university honours course. But they are not primarily academic types, and, as things are at present organized, it seems a waste of time and money to keep them milling over the academic ground for a further two years, whatever else besides academic lessons they have to learn.

Apart entirely from economic relief, there are great and positive contributions which the modern universities can offer in the matter of the training of ordinands. The small honours school (with not more than, say, fifty or sixty undergraduates) in the modern university is one of the most effective teaching instruments ever devised, and one to which there is no parallel at all in the ancient universities. It constitutes a college within the wider university society, an intimate fellowship of teachers and taught, in which common friendships, goals and interests may lead to the transcending of staff-student barriers in a genuinely personal way. It is hard to describe to those who have not had experience of it. A theological honours school may become a real fellowship not only of study, but also of worship, evangelism and ecumenical encounter, in association with the wider life of the chapel (if there is one) and of the religious societies of the university. From the moment that he first arrives at the university the undergraduate (or new lecturer) may feel that his Christian life is being integrated with his study and is at the same time turned outwards towards the broader concerns of the university and its societies, games and social activities. The university chaplain should be able to find here a source of power that is of immense value in his work, to the great benefit also of the theological students themselves. They will feel something of what it means to be the Church in the university. From his first arrival in the university the theological student thus begins his personal and pastoral training. Here the rôle of the chaplain is vital. He should act from the beginning as a kind of theological college "principal" in relation to the ordinands of his own denomination (not only those of the theology department, of course); his status and authority in this regard should be confirmed and emphasized officially by the Church's authorities (e.g. C.A.C.T.M.). The Anglican chaplain will say the daily offices with the ordinands and generally look after their spiritual development. The fact that his "college" does not live under the same roof but

is scattered around the halls of residence and the "digs" is a positive advantage; it means that he has personal assistants at many strategic points in his vast "parish". He will be quick to associate the ordinands with himself in the work of the Church in the university society. He will at times withdraw them from that wider society, but only that they may be sent back into it with a clearer understanding of their responsibility for it.

Finally, the question must be raised concerning the responsibility of the theological school in the modern university towards the wider society beyond its own membership, even though the matter cannot here be adequately discussed. The question is in two parts. First, how can a theological department purvey theological instruction to the members of other schools and faculties? It is clearly not enough for the theological teachers to speak only to one small section of the vast multitude of students on the campus; this, surely, is not all that a theological school is called upon to do. Experience in different places has shown that there exists a real demand for and appreciation of the right kind of instruction concerning the Christian faith. How best can this demand be met? And, secondly, what is the responsibility of a theological school in a modern university towards that wider public, beyond the campus altogether, which is concerned about theology and desires instruction? What can be done for the clergy, ministers and teachers who look for guidance and refreshment to the theological staff of their local university? But before we go any further with these questions we should perhaps pause and reflect how small are the teaching staffs in the departments concerned: which of us, desiring to build a tower, should not first sit down and count the cost?

ALAN RICHARDSON.

Theology and the Ministry

IT would be true to say that in the last generation we have witnessed a widespread theological revival. It would also be true to say that the need for more responsible action among Christians in the general life of modern society has been constantly expressed, and the modes of that action have been frequently defined.

How far has this new stirring of life affected the ordinary churches of Britain? No one can answer that question with confidence because, obviously, the church situation varies greatly from place to place and from denomination to denomination. What can probably be safely said is that it does not appear to be affecting the churches with the speed and effectiveness which their situation demands and which the resources available make possible. Theological revival may have affected ordinary preaching to the extent that it is less impressionistic and more orthodox in content than it often was a generation ago, but those who have opportunity to listen to sermons in widely differing contexts have complained that they lack distinction and the

ability to fire the imagination of their auditors. And while there are a few worth-while and much publicized experiments in new forms of church life and in efforts to fulfil their social responsibilities among Christians, their number hardly indicates that the churches are adequately adapting themselves to the circumstances of this exciting and dangerous time.

In saying this, the last thing I should want to imply is that the quality of the Church's effectiveness must be judged by the number of interesting experiments it is undertaking. A great deal of quiet rebuilding has to go on in the churches to-day, and probably the level of pastoral diligence of a routine but essential type displayed by clergy and ministers was never higher. This is encouraging as far as it goes, but the question remains whether it is sufficient in a time of great upheaval when many things cry out to be done and are badly neglected.

Various reasons can be given for our deficiencies in this respect. It is the purpose of this article to raise the question of whether the present state of theological education is one of them. This is a familiar cry. If my observations have any originality it is because they are made from the point of view of one who believes firmly in theological education and who does not propose that the solution of our problems lies in the substitution of other disciplines of a so-called "practical" nature for theology.

It is extraordinary that, despite the changing intellectual climate, the upheaval caused by two world wars, the great developments in the general field of education and the sweeping changes in the patterns of industrial and social life which have taken place in the last couple of generations, theological education should remain substantially as it was before 1914. Surprisingly many Anglican theological colleges still inhabit their retired workhouses in quiet and remote cathedral cities. They, with preparatory schools, remain—if an irreverent Dissenter may hazard the observation—almost the last stronghold of the gentleman amateur in English life. The fact that the gentleman's means are now considerably reduced may add to their period charm, but while it is an English foible to cherish institutions the more remote from contemporary taste they become, churchmen concerned for revival can hardly take this Betjemanite view.

The situation in the Free Churches is a little different because the Free Churches have, proportionately, always paid more attention to their theological colleges than the Church of England. But here also, they can hardly be held to have kept up with all the changes necessary to meet the modern world. They have become steadily poorer and have had to manage with smaller staffs. Many of the ablest theologians among the Free Churches are actively engaged in theological teaching but do not teach prospective Free Church ministers, and plans for urgently needed amalgamations of over-small Congregational and Baptist theological colleges proceed at a very slow rate. All this is in startling contrast with the vigour and enterprise displayed by American theological seminaries since the war.

The major development in the organization of English theological education which has taken place since the war is described by Professor Alan Richardson in another article in this number, the great expansion of provision for theological teaching and study at the modern universities. As Professor Richardson points out, the churches have been remarkably slow to take advantage of this situation. I know that there are many good practical reasons why this should be so. The question is whether they are sufficiently strong to justify the relative inactivity of the churches. Their record in relation to the modern universities in general might be described in temperate terms as one of missed opportunities. They are now showing signs of interest in these institutions to the extent of appointing denominational chaplains whose primary purpose often seems to be to shepherd their alarmingly submissive flocks into nearby churches which have little sense of responsibility to the universities themselves. A far more creative move would be to bring the theological community directly into the life of the university. If it be protested that one of the functions of the theological college is devotional training, we may agree, but it is surely a further confession of irrelevance to assume that it is impossibly difficult to undertake this while pursuing a course of university study. Christians have been rightly critical of many of the secularizing tendencies of the modern university; their excessive specialism, the lack of contact between faculties, inadequate staff-student relationships, the trivialization of subjects studied. The foundation of departments or faculties of theology in so many new universities gives them a great opportunity to help remedy this situation. How much use are they making of it?

Nor can it be said that the situation in the traditional centres of ecclesiastical activity, Oxford and Cambridge, is any more cheerful. Although they are extravagantly staffed with theologians in comparison with other British universities, they remain remarkably immune from the influences of the modern world, at least as far as curriculum is concerned. No one will cavil at their proper emphasis upon the primary importance of biblical and historical studies, but is it satisfactory that systematic theology and the study of ethics in relation to modern society should continue to receive such scant attention? Even their historical study remains firmly established upon traditional lines. I speak without the book, but how many courses of lectures on American church history have been given in the University of Oxford in recent years? Yet I venture to say that no subject is of greater strategic importance for the future of the Church than this.

Theological teachers must bear their due share of the blame for the state of theological education, but it is clearly a responsibility of the churches as a whole. In particular, the overworked staffs of theological colleges themselves have a right to complain of the indifference of the rest of the members of the churches to their task. Whoever may be responsible, the churches are failing badly at a time of great educational advance in situations which are directly within their own control and where the future of church life is determined

more readily than anywhere else. It is an impertinence for bishops and other prominent clerics to speak of the secularization of modern education when the state of theological education provides perhaps the most striking demonstration of parsimony, low standards and timid conservatism in the whole educational field.

It is not for me to suggest remedies for other churches than my own for this situation. There are two particular observations which I should like to make, however, which apply to most churches. The first is that the quality of theological insight made available to ordinary church members will not improve until fewer men are accepted for the ministry. This is a most unpopular line to take, but the arguments in its favour seem to me to be incontrovertible. Theological curricula need to be revised, more theological colleges should be amalgamated and drawn closer to universities, theological college staffs should be better trained and better paid, much more creative efforts should be made to devise training programs in pastoral work for students. But all these are secondary to the necessity of having a higher degree of competence among students themselves. We are bedevilled in relation to this by preconceived notions concerning the number of clergy required by the various churches. Writers pleading for more men for the ministry always invoke statistics which show how there were far more clergy to serve a smaller population in Victorian days than there are now. The mistake they make is to assume that the organization of the churches derived from the past is sacrosanct, that the Church of England should indefinitely maintain an archaic parochial structure, and that the Free Churches should take their position in the period of indiscriminate Victorian expansionism as normative. The chief question to ask in regard to recruitment for the clergy is not how many jobs bishops or moderators or superintendents think they can fill, but, given the size of the effective Christian community in society and the competing claims on the time and energy of committed Christian people, how many genuinely called people can reasonably be expected to appear. When the present state of recruitment for the ministries of the churches is looked at in this light, the remarkable thing is not that numbers are somewhat diminished from Victorian times but that so many come forward. I know that standards have improved in some ways since the war, but it is still doubtful whether there is not a serious dilution of labour among the clergy. If history proves anything, it is that bad clergy are worse than no clergy. If present experience suggests anything, it is that stupid clergy are unable to meet the demands of the present situation with the energy and adaptability and insight which, even on the basis of the most rigidly *ex opere operato* theory of the ministry, they undoubtedly require.

In saying this I am not suggesting simply that we should require a higher academic standard from prospective candidates for the ministry. On the contrary, one of the creative contributions which theological colleges might be able to make to modern education is to develop further ways of discerning genuine gifts of ministry among those who have not succeeded in steering their course carefully

enough through the well-charted waters of our modern educational system. But I think the time is ripe for a sharp protest against the notion that intelligence is a slightly suspect quality and likely to be a handicap rather than otherwise in an earnest clergyman who wishes to succeed with the modern community. Nothing is a more crass form of secularism than for the ministry of the churches to surrender to the unreason of our time. Whatever may have been the case in other times, the greatest enemy of genuine faith in modern England, as it is of effective social action, is probably intellectual laziness. The fact that the Church is often rightly regarded as the very citadel of community prejudice and stupidity is an indication of how far we have strayed from our true function. An easy-going goodwill is common enough in our midst; we languish for the lack of the application of disciplined and self-critical intelligence to all except our most severely technical problems. Is it inconceivable to think of theological colleges as the power-houses of the new intellectual vitality which this country so badly needs? If it is inconceivable, they should be closed.

The other point I want to make deals to some extent with a separate subject, but its connexion with the theme of this article is so close that it deserves to be mentioned. It is that the problem of the intellectual and spiritual replenishment of the ministry remains almost untouched.

Pontypridd station in South Wales is a busy junction for a large number of railway lines serving the mining valleys. On Monday mornings a generation ago it was a minor hive of activity because of the large number of ministers and theological students who were changing trains after taking services on the Sunday in innumerable churches in the valleys. They were known to the porters in the station as the "returned empties". Many ministers, after a few years in the ministry, must feel that that aptly describes their plight, but the trouble is that no arrangements exist for them to go somewhere to be refilled. The occasional summer school or reading course is not enough. A change of environment and an opportunity for sustained and disciplined re-equipment is necessary. A friend of mine once observed that whenever he visited a clergyman he always looked around his study shelves to find out when he died. We do not have to believe that the state of a minister's or clergyman's reading is the only index of his spiritual vitality to recognize the truth in that observation and to allow that only too many of us are at the point of death. I cannot pretend to offer a solution for dealing with this large problem, but I am sure that to institute a system of sabbatical years for ministers, who need them more than professors, would in the long run prove to be sound sense and wise economy. Life in the modern world makes heavy demands on spiritual and intellectual resources, as it does upon material. Even though they know constant refreshment through the means of grace and study and through sharing in the common life of their congregations, the drain on ministers and clergy is particularly heavy. The most effective way in which the churches can help busy people in the modern world overcome their

tendency to become rapidly tired, stale and harassed is by solving the problem of maintaining the vitality and freshness of their own ministers.

DANIEL JENKINS.

Integrity in Apologetics

or

THE DANGERS OF RESORTING TO BLUFF IN THEOLOGY[1]

MR STEPHEN POTTER, the professional humorist, has lately added a new word to the English language—the word "Lifemanship". For those unfamiliar with his book of that title I should explain that it is defined as the art of keeping "one up" in a conversation, or in writing, and making other people feel "one down". The subject of this paper might perhaps best be described as "theological lifemanship"—the habit, which I believe to be very common in church circles to-day, of trying to win acceptance for the Christian faith in general, or for some particular form of church practice such as sacramentalism, by implying subtly that it is more intellectually or aesthetically respectable than the alternatives.

One of the commonest forms of this is the dismissal of opinions contrary to your own as "hopelessly out of date" or, more subtly, as "quaintly old-fashioned". This is very often done without any appeal to facts at all—the attempt is made to carry the day by pure snobbery, totally ignoring the fact that an old-fashioned view is not necessarily untrue. Of course, this sort of thing is by no means unknown in non-theological quarters of the academic and intellectual world, but that is no excuse for it: on the contrary, it represents—as does all lifemanship—one of the nastiest aspects of that fear-based organization of life which the New Testament calls "worldliness", and churchmen should lean over backwards to avoid any suspicion that it can invade the life of the Church. In fact, however, Christian intellectual circles are amongst the most snobbish in the country, not only in this particular respect but in other ways as well. Debates within the theological world itself, for example, are frequently conducted in terms of whether one has or has not read the works of the latest fashionable theologian (usually French or German). To profess a regard for the *last* fashionable thinker is to invite ridicule (witness the current tendency to condemn anyone who is still trying to follow up the insights of Martin Buber into the importance of personal relationships as "a sufferer from Bubery!").

But theological lifemanship is (regrettably) by no means confined to the "highbrows" who indulge in these more refined forms of snobbery. Apologetic speaking and writing have become infected with it

[1] An expanded version of this essay will appear in *Essays in Anglican Self-Criticism*, to be published shortly by the S.C.M. Press.

everywhere. The reason is, I think, that for nearly a century now churchmen in the English-speaking world—indeed in much of the whole civilized world—have been in the situation of having to maintain their beliefs against the general trend of scholarly opinion. Now it is often said, particularly within the Church of England, that Christianity thrives on opposition, but in this respect at any rate the moral effects of living in a critical atmosphere are anything but healthy. Both professional and lay apologists tend no longer to see their task as one of witnessing to the truth, still less of proclaiming good news; they see it rather as a matter of "proving something", of justifying themselves in a perpetual shadow-boxing match, and the temptation, in such a situation, to try to score points by methods which are not quite honest is considerable. The commonest way in which would-be apologists succumb to it is by implying that *really* modern discoveries, in science or elsewhere, prove that Christian claims were "right all along".

Thus from pulpits and lecture-platforms all over the country we may hear it proclaimed that—for example—the more negative kinds of criticism of the Bible are "nineteenth-century aberrations", or that the advance of science has now discredited materialism, or that the psychological criticisms of religious belief associated with the name of Freud are now obsolete. If reason is given for such assertions at all, it is usually simply the mention of a few magic names—Dodd in the field of biblical criticism, Heisenberg or Einstein in the field of natural science, and Jung in the case of psychology. In very many cases, however, the clergyman or layman who makes the assertion has never read any of the people in question, and in the case of the physicists or psychologists would not understand them if he did. The technique is one which Mr Potter's book describes in detail, as "mentioning the O.K. name": Dr Goebbels had a cruder term for it—propaganda, the repetition of a statement so often that people come to believe it whether it is true or not.

Now even if the assertions *were* true, the use of this technique would be utterly immoral—*and moreover would achieve no good end.* For people outside the churches are never impressed by this sort of assertion; they only feel they are being "blinded with science". And if they impress people inside the Church, as they often do, the result is not to "strengthen the faith", as is usually held—it is rather to build up a conviction of superiority which ought properly to be called spiritual pride. But all too often the situation is worsened by the fact that the assertions made are not true at all, or are true only in a misleading sense. In such cases the Christian faith is frequently brought into disrepute for people who really know the facts.

It is quite untrue, for example, that modern historical scholarship has done anything to invalidate the more serious criticisms which historians at the turn of the century levelled against the Bible as a support for Christian orthodoxy. All that has really happened is that theological Bible-scholars have ceased to worry about the criticisms. They have shifted the ground of the discussion, arguing that the claims of the New Testament are such that "scientific" historical

scholarship could not in the nature of the case be expected to validate them. The general effect of their work, in other words, is *to make it clear that the orthodox interpretation of the biblical documents depends upon a prior acceptance of at least the probability of the orthodox position*—so that it is a complete falsification of the case to say that they have done anything to remove the difficulties of orthodox belief. Yet this is just what is alleged, overtly or by implication.

This particular piece of lifemanship is in fact usually made to rest, when its proponents are pressed, upon the other claims I have mentioned. "The point is," they say, "that the nineteenth-century critics automatically assumed they had to explain away anything in the Bible which contradicted their materialistic assumptions, but now we know that those assumptions were not necessary by any means." Now this is only very partially true. It was not a dogmatic prejudice in favour of materialism but a well-grounded understanding of the way human minds embrace illusions which led to most of the critical attacks on the Bible, while the criticisms of certain passages in the New Testament, upon which orthodox apologists still continue to base their doctrines, was often purely textual and had no reference to metaphysical assumptions whatever. But it undoubtedly *is* true that in some fields the interpretations put upon an historical record will vary according to what the historian believes to be within the bounds of possibility. How far, then, is it correct to say that modern developments in science have cut the ground from under the feet of those who doubt the assertions of the Christian faith?

The claim is usually made in reference to three scientific developments. First, it is said that relativity theory and quantum physics have "rendered materialism and determinism untenable". Secondly, it is claimed that, after the first flush of the success of Darwinism, modern biology has begun to retreat from the strict Darwinian position and is now more or less obliged to admit the notion of "design" or "purpose" in the study of living things. And, thirdly, it is said that investigations in the field of psychical research, carried out by means of endlessly repeated, laborious card-guessing experiments, have proved beyond any shadow of doubt that there are non-material forces at work in the world. In each of these cases, however, the claim is in the strictest sense untrue, *and even if it were true it would be of little or no help to establishing the allowability of the Christian position.*

To take first the case of modern physics: the "O.K. names" usually mentioned here are, as I said, Einstein, in relation to the theory of relativity, and Heisenberg, in relation to the quantum theory and the famous "principle of uncertainty". But what the former has to do with the case I cannot imagine: a four-dimensional space-time continuum may not be much like the material systems imagined in Newtonian physics, but it is not a whit more "spiritual", and a unified field-theory giving a constant value to the velocity of light is just as little (or just as much) in need of the hypothesis of a Creator as the theory discussed by Laplace. As for the principle of uncertainty, the

full philosophical implications of this are still under discussion by the experts: Einstein died believing that it would prove to be no more than a measure of human ignorance, not a fundamental fact about the Universe itself, whilst amongst those who most wholeheartedly believe to-day that it *is* a fact about the Universe, there are as many who have adapted it to a modified form of materialism as there are who have followed Heisenberg himself into "immaterialism". The subject is undeniably one of interest to the Christian philosopher, and I believe it probably *is* true to say that in the end of the day the kinds of theory current in modern physics fit better into a religious than a non-religious view of the Universe, but that is quite a different thing from saying that materialism and determinism have been "disproved" or "rendered untenable". The experts should certainly be discussing the matter, but we are not in any position for non-experts to make apologetic capital out of it—for even if the doubtful points were to be resolved, and we *could* state that the Universe was fundamentally indeterministic and "immaterial", this would not in itself be any support for Christian belief. After all, if a miracle *did* happen in a Newtonian universe it would certainly be a supernatural sign: in an undetermined Universe it might be pure chance, totally without meaning.

In the field of biology, the statement that biologists are being forced to retreat from strict Darwinism and admit the idea of "directing purpose" to explain living phenomena is totally untrue. The few biologists who take up this position are by no means representative of the best biological thought: the theory of evolution by natural selection from random variations has undoubtedly been modified, but in its modern form it is certainly regarded, by most biologists, as adequate to explain how living forms have developed. Moreover, amongst biologists themselves, the Christians are more often than not to be found on the side of mechanistic explanations, vigorously opposing the idea of "creative evolution" or "purposive design": for they recognize what Kant saw long ago, *that these ideas, if accepted, imply the existence not of an Almighty God but of a blind life-force or limited demiurge.* Here again, in fact, the claim that is commonly made by religious apologists on the basis of what has been read in various books on "science and religion" falls to the ground as soon as it is examined.

The studies carried out by "psychical researchers" or parapsychologists do seem to establish that odd things happen in the world, but it would be a rash materialist who attempted to deny *that.* It is very doubtful whether anything else can be said to have been established yet. The card-guessing experiments which are so often quoted as having "proved the existence of the non-material by cast-iron scientific methods", are too much like the evidence adduced to prove that Marlowe left cryptograms of his name in Shakespeare's plays, or that the British came from Israel, to be really convincing to many scientists. The results undoubtedly show statistical oddities which current statistical theory has not yet succeeded in explaining, but it is hard to say that they prove the existence of the non-material when

there is such a wide field of possibilities open for describing the nature of non-material phenomena. It would be a great help to research in this field if the results could be taken out of the statistical category, but this is something which the workers involved seem reluctant to do—for example, in the attempts to demonstrate "telekinesis", the possibility that mind can influence matter directly, the objects chosen were ones notoriously subject to chance anyway, i.e. falling dice and small living organisms. It may yet transpire that Mr Spencer Brown is right in holding that what these experiments really demonstrate is that chance is not quite what the mathematicians thought it was. Accordingly, although this whole field—particularly the study of so-called "spontaneous cases" of odd phenomena —is one to be watched with interest, it is still, like fundamental physics, a field for expert discussion, and does not provide suitable ground at all for the foundation of large-scale theological conclusions. And it is also true that here too it would scarcely be an unequivocal benefit to Christian theology even if some of the claims of current parapsychologists were established. Professor Rhine, for example, sees in the phenomena he believes to be taking place, evidence that the human mind is but a cell of a Universal Mind—but that is a concept quite as alien from the Christian view of man as materialist doctrines could ever be.

The truth is, in fact, that the recent developments in science, even if they *are* suggestive and interesting to Christians, presuppose a *prior* acceptance of the Christian position before they are of any value, exactly as the findings of modern Bible critics do. If pressed into admitting *this*, however, it is likely that the theological Lifeman will take refuge in the third field I mentioned at the beginning, the field of psychology, and in particular the magic name of Jung—with perhaps a side-glance at the field of philosophy. Until recently, he will say, the prevailing atmosphere in both these fields was anti-religious, inasmuch as the "logical positivists" thought they had established that theological propositions were meaningless and the psychologists thought, following Freud, that they could explain the origin of theological ideas as wish-fulfilment fantasies; but now the most recent developments point in exactly the opposite direction, since the philosophers have recognized that what they were really doing was simply to show the limitations of scientific discourse, and are prepared to affirm the validity of other kinds of discourse which is not subject to the tests of science, whilst on the other hand psychology, thanks to Jung, has shown that religious belief is rooted in human nature. The Lifeman will probably quote at this point Wittgenstein's dictum that the mystical shows itself, and urge us all to proceed to find conviction forthwith by celebrating the Liturgy.

This is probably the most pernicious of all the forms of theological Lifemanship I have discussed up to now, and involves the greatest misrepresentation of the facts. To begin with, it is really quite untrue to say that the neo-Wittgensteinians are in any way *representative* of the most modern philosophy, or the Jungians of modern analytical psychology. Both are very much minority groups,

and it would be a very partisan view which described them as the most advanced minorities. The majority of modern philosophers may no longer be "logical positivists", but they would certainly not concede the right of a theologian to be talking sense unless he could give some account of what his statements meant—and there are hardly any philosophers outside the Roman Catholic schools who would be prepared to accept such statements as metaphysical truths from which deductions concerning conduct could be drawn. In the field of psychology, too, there may be very few psychologists to-day who follow Freud absolutely strictly, but all the most creative movements still derive from him, and Jung is regarded in most quarters as old-fashioned mystical mumbo-jumbo. True, that is no guarantee that he is wrong—it may be scientific lifemanship to some extent!—but it *does* mean that he cannot be called either representative or established. What is still more important about him, however, is that his conclusions are really just as inimical to Christian belief, if not more so, than Freud's ever were. At the level of logic, if Jung is right in holding that the brain has an inbuilt tendency to produce religious imagery, that is surely all the more reason for holding that religious ideas are just "projections". And if it be replied that Jung has introduced the new category of "psychological truth", then it must surely be admitted that he is really advocating religious belief as something much like Plato's "noble lie". I do not believe myself that this is what Jung actually intends; I believe he has had an undoubtedly religious experience which he is trying to convey to others. This is not the least ground for saying, however, that he has established the validity of religious belief by scientific psychology, as is very frequently claimed by Christian apologists who have never really read him. Moreover, it must be added that although some Christian theologians like Fr Victor White have been convinced that Jung is urging his followers towards a rediscovery of Christianity, the evidence in fact seems to be much more that Martin Buber is right in holding that the effect of Jung's work is rather to establish a new gnostic pseudo-religion of self-cultivation and a "life-force". Freud himself once said that he wished sometimes that he had stuck to his Judaism, so that he could stand up in front of Jung and thunder "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain!"

All this may seem to be very hard on the Christian apologist, but it is not really so if he does not set out with the misconceived notion that his job is to prove something. It is the fundamental defensive attitude which is at fault: "Maginot-mindedness" is always a prelude to collapse, because it is a symptom of lack of real faith. This does *not* mean, however, that the apologist ought to take an aggressive and superior attitude. There have been quite a few apologists in recent decades who, seeing that it is fruitless to make the Christian witness depend on "modern thought", have taken up the attitude that the Church should make no concessions to modern thought at all, but should rather base itself firmly on its traditional faith and *criticize* the passing panorama of new ideas from that basis. The most prominent amongst these have been the theologians who distinguish

between *doctrine*, which may change with changing thought-forms, and *dogma*, which, they say, cannot change *and cannot be criticized* because it represents the point of view from which we choose to look at everything else. This sort of attitude results in "critiques" of modern thought *de haut en bas*, which probably do more to alienate the educated man of the scientific age than anything else. But the apologists in question have a defence all ready against this alienation —they say it is "the offence of the Gospel". In fact, it is nothing of the kind: it is the offence of a different form of lifemanship, the offence of an aggressiveness which is simply defensiveness concealed. Amongst the techniques of lifemanship used in this case we may note the appeal to culture-snobbery ("Only Christianity can of course give any basis for *real* culture—didn't Mr Eliot say so?") and the appeal to fear ("Look where the world is getting with all these modern movements—science gives us the hydrogen bomb, greater education breeds teddy-boys, etc."). This is certainly not the way of the true Christian apologist.

What is really needed to-day, by a very large number of those whose job or vocation it is to be vocal about Christianity, is a radically self-critical pause for breath, and an attempt to practice the new honesty which psycho-analysis is urging upon us all, of asking why in fact we do ourselves *want* to defend this or that belief-system. The would-be apologist should ask himself why *he* believes in the Christian faith sufficiently to want to defend it—and if it transpires (as it well may) that what he is defending is only an emotionally toned fantasy-system to which he clings because it makes his life more "meaningful", then let him have the honesty to stop being an apologist forthwith, for he has himself as yet no grasp of real faith, so he certainly cannot convey faith to others. But this need not necessarily be the conclusion. It is to be hoped that a self-examination of the kind I have suggested will in most cases reveal that the real root of the apologist's convictions is *an experience which he cannot seriously bring himself to deny*—and the recognition of this fact is surely of the utmost importance, for does it not recall us to the realization that the primary purpose of Christian apologetics should always be *witness to a known truth* rather than the proof of an hypothesis? The strength of the old-fashioned type of "conversion" evangelism is that it has never forgotten this fact, and if Anglicans in general are inclined to doubt whether the highly individual "Christ-experience" to which this type of evangelism appeals is really the full or even the central Christian experience, the fact remains that genuine belief must start from the discovery of *some* fact in *life*—in my own view, the fact of new life in the relationships of the Christian community. If for any man Christian belief is not rooted in such experience, but *is* only as yet a conjecture, then to him I think another piece of Wittgenstein advice might be offered—"Of what we cannot speak, let us be silent". But if the wish to offer an apology for faith springs from a genuine discovery in experience which seems to demand that faith, then let us say so—and then work out the intellectual side of that apology in the true spirit of humility which the Apostle himself

enjoined, recognizing that there are not likely to be any easy "answers" to current unbelief, and that much patient, humble study will be required.

JOHN WREN LEWIS.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Bliss is Chairman of the Board of the Ecumenical Institute, Bossey, Switzerland.

Dr Richardson is Professor of Theology in the University of Nottingham and an Hon. Canon of Derby Cathedral.

Mr Daniel Jenkins is Minister of the King's Weigh House Congregational Church in London and helps the Christian Frontier Council. He visits the University of Chicago for one quarter each year as professor of theology.

Mr Wren Lewis is a member of the Research Department of one of our largest industrial concerns.

CORRESPONDENCE

SECT OR CHURCH?

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The Rev. Wilfrid Browning pictures "a nightmarish vision of thousands of Rectors of Woodford battering down the Church of England of the Carolines, etc., and turning the Establishment into a perfectionist sect".

There are worse nightmares even than that. One is this. A parish priest, who has succeeded in convincing all his parishioners that by being titular members of the Established Church their eternal welfare is secure, finds himself in their company on the Judgment Day. As they pass before the Judge, and he finds it impossible to recognize them as his own, they point accusing fingers at their parish priest, and say, "*He* never warned us that all was not well with us. He allowed us to make meaningless promises as sponsors and parents: he let us stand in the place of Christians for our marriage: he never gave us an interim judgment on our lives, to remind us of the Judgment that was to come. He has blessed us to hell." And the Judge turns to see this priest of his. . . .

I am not competent to champion the Rev. Martin Thornton's position. But might I examine with your readers this "perfectionist sect" at Woodford?

The parish has a population (new census) of 8,038. There are four

flourishing Nonconformist churches within its boundaries, and two of other communions (Roman and Baptist) equally flourishing just outside. In addition, seven adjoining parishes are very much alive. In the face of this keen Christian competition, the perfectionist sect at St Mary's, Woodford, mustered a fairly normal 425 Christmas Day communicants, representing, shall we say, a "St Mary's community" of 800 persons, young and old, or one-tenth of the total population; and offering a Christmas Day collection of £128 for extra-parochial objects—perhaps a small indication that the missionary vocation ranks slightly higher than altar flowers.

The parochial quota assessment, by a small margin the highest in the diocese for the past five years, and now standing at £603, is not put forward as a proof of the rightness of its "perfectionist" principles, seeing that a neighbouring parish (the only other 600-pounder in the diocese) baptizes and marries in a manner which would rejoice Mr Browning's heart. But it may fairly be claimed to show that these principles do not lead to a parish avoiding its ordinary obligations.

Admittedly marriages in 1957 (limited to five) and infant baptisms (four) might seem small in relation to a total parochial population (Jews and all) of 8,038, but it is not quite out of proportion if regarded as the propagation rate of a committed Christian fellowship of 800.

On what perfectionist principle is the parish's system based? Simply on this, that the "judgment" which the incumbent uses as a standard of faith and practice for young Christians at their confirmation is also applied in determining the right and due administration of other covenanted means of grace when the participants are further along the valley of human decision, and present themselves to the Church on the threshold of marriage, or in the role of sponsors and parents of their own children. The unthinkable demand made upon them is that they shall at least still have retained teenage faith and practice.

This teenage faith and practice is nothing more than a love for the Lord of the Church which shows itself in regular Sunday worship, regular communion, and regular financial support of his Church (the amount of the last being entirely left to the person concerned, young or old, and ranging from threepence to ten shillings a week).

It may be noted that this "judgment" is merely an interim one, intended to "warn, to comfort and command", and obviously subject to radical adjustment on the Last Day. Nor is it claimed that the withholding of a sacramental means of grace, say of a service of Holy Matrimony, if mistakenly withheld, prevents God's blessing on a couple without that particular means. To claim this would be to claim too much for the Church on earth.

It is also to be noted that it is only those means of grace to which definite covenants are attached, that is to say, Confirmation, Holy Baptism (or, rather, the reception into the visible Church which is joined to Holy Baptism in our Church service), and Holy Matrimony, which are made the subjects of this "judgment". All the other, uncovenanted, means of grace which the Church dispenses, of which

the chief is the proclamation of the Gospel inside and outside Divine Service, are freely offered to the total parochial population. This is the necessary and vital safeguard which prevents the Church from becoming a sect.

It would be wrong, and quite impossible, to assess the missionary activity of this or any other parish. But it is equally obvious that a new sense of missionary concern is growing, and is evidenced in such ways as regular, though admittedly insufficient, house-to-house visiting by members of the congregation with their clergy.

Yours sincerely,
CHRISTOPHER WANSEY.

THE RECTORY,
WOODFORD,
LONDON, E.18.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In his sweeping criticisms of Fr Thornton's book, *Pastoral Theology*, the Rev. W. Browning seems to miss the point of supreme importance in Fr Thornton's thesis; namely, that the whole object of the Christian life is the glory of God through the attainment of that pure holiness of human personality, without which no man shall see the Lord.

It is a fact of history that Christian holiness has found its most lofty expression in the great monastic orders of monks and nuns, whose lives have been nurtured on the Divine Office, Mass and the highest reaches of contemplative prayer; and Fr Thornton is surely right in believing that unless the Church to-day can win a double portion of this monastic holiness her efforts to convert mankind will be futile. But we cannot have Christian sanctity without paying the price of this pearl of great price in utmost self-discipline, and continual adoration of God, as Fr Thornton implies and teaches in his most significant book.

Mr Browning too easily assumes that Fr Thornton has no compassion for the multitudes outside the Church, but no such conclusion can rightly be drawn from a dispassionate study of *Pastoral Theology*. "For their sakes I sanctify myself," said our Lord; and it is with the object of fulfilling the Church's missionary calling with realism and power that Fr Thornton stresses the vital necessity of sanctity in the lives of true Christians. In this connexion, I should have thought that our Lord's preference for the contemplative Mary over the busy, fussy Martha gives significant support to Fr Thornton's conclusions.

Finally, Mr Browning should note that Dr R. H. Lightfoot, in his Commentary on St John, gives full support to Fr Thornton, by maintaining with him that, at the close of his ministry, our Lord turned away from the multitude; and the reason for this is made

clear by Lightfoot: "their superficiality, their unbelief, their thronging tends to make Christ's task impossible, and so he has to avoid them" (pp. 63 ff.).

Would to God that many modern clergymen and evangelists shared Christ's detachment, and his determination to build a true Kingdom of God, rather than a merely populous one!

Yours sincerely,
J. A. Powell.

St Catherine's Vicarage,
Barmby Moor,
York.

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Pastoral Theology: A Reorientation is almost as dangerous as holy writ. Mr Browning is rightly concerned about its dynamic philosophy. The subject, as the author says, is one for a group of writers, but is it not also for a group of parish priests? Some of us had to begin in new housing areas without a meeting-place of any kind. Here, and in large and over-organized parishes, we have tended to gather around ourselves the prayer group, the study group, etc., and almost accidentally we have stumbled into a remnant pastoralia.

These trained and representative remnants, far from becoming Jansenist or sectarian, have become the live centres of evangelism and missionary zeal. The already existing exclusive clubs have become less exclusive and the faithful few have been used on behalf of the many. Many parish priests appear to be building up good congregations in this way and helping the confirmed and the catechumenate to the realities of a supernatural religion.

Dangerous it may be, but it is worthy of the study which it is provoking.

Yours faithfully,
H. Hammersley.

The Vicarage,
Redcar.

INTINCTION

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

It is a common occurrence for newly engaged couples to discover to their surprise and delight that they, who had previously believed private cups and glasses to be an absolute necessity, can now drink willingly and even eagerly from each other's. The use of the common cup expresses their relationship.

It is surely a matter for thanksgiving that in the English Church nearly all communicants find the common cup a natural expression

of their *κοινωνία*, because they too are, in another but related sense, in love.

It is significant that scruples about the common cup originate in a part of the world where more and more food is emasculated in the interests of hygiene, where battery eggs are liked because those from the farmyard "taste". We in England are already involved in this flight from nature, which is a fashionable symptom of our fallen state, but we have preserved our innocence at least in this, that we accept the common cup in communion as natural. It would be a sad and negative thing if this acceptance were disturbed (probably irreparably) by the transatlantic scruples of a minority.

If health were really endangered such a disturbance might be necessary, but the question was fully discussed a few years ago in an often-quoted article in *The Lancet*, which found the danger of infection to be negligible owing to the sterility of silver and ironed linen. If the objection to the common cup is only "aesthetic" (how unaesthetic a word) then surely we should try to overcome it and save people from being influenced by it. It must spring from a sinful preoccupation with our own separateness, which ought to be broken down in the very act of receiving common Life.

Yours sincerely,
BRIAN DUPRÉ.

ELSWORTH RECTORY,
CAMBRIDGE.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I was taught that the sacraments are outward and visible signs; and I try to teach my (not very numerous) confirmation candidates to use and value their visible symbolism. By waiting with hands upraised for the priest's ministration (the undisputed ancient custom of the Church) they visibly acknowledge their dependence on God's grace in that Church. By receiving in their own hands, they proclaim the complementary truth, that the whole Christian body is a "holy priesthood", and that grace must work through human wills and human action. It is a false reverence that would make them wholly passive recipients; they should humbly welcome the Lord's own presence to bless their hands and all that they do. I say that in common decency and courtesy they should cleanse their hands; but not be scrupulous if they fail to do so perfectly. For why should I deceive myself and them? I too am "a man of unclean lips": I have no clean place to offer my Lord; least of all my mouth, which physically is prone to infection, and spiritually is the very place where my sinful thoughts find utterance. Nor was the stable at Bethlehem clean. Our reliance is not on some ritual purity, which must be fictitious, but on the Lord's own cleansing power and presence.

In all this, however, it is not easy to realize that "we all eat of one loaf"; the more necessary, therefore, that we should actually and

visibly drink of one cup, and thus enact and revive our fellowship in Christ. For next to the danger of making the Communion a mere emotional experience which offers no challenge to will and action, our besetting weakness, I believe, is to degrade it to an individual reunion with a private Saviour. I can see no alternative to the common practice of our Church, as sanctioned by the Prayer Book, which fully and plainly sets forth the meaning of the sacrament in terms that the simple can understand. And what object can compare with this in importance?

Medicine, like religion, has its cranks and perfectionists; but most of us realize that we live in a world where complete security is impossible; we have to use our common sense and trust in providence. It may be right to make exceptions for individual invalids, or in times of common sickness; it is beyond all reason to abandon a central act of our corporate worship. There may come a day when I no longer visit the sick, or travel in crowded trains, or kiss my beloved; when I feel an abhorrence (which I now do not) for the secular loving-cup. Until that day I will not single out the holy sacrament for hygienic limitations; and I can feel only grief and amazement that my fellow-Christians should so lightly forfeit the privilege of obeying the Lord's command to drink of his cup in the simple and direct way which he must have envisaged.

Yours sincerely,
G. C. Stead.

Keble College,
Oxford.
17 *January* 1958.

NATIONAL SERVICE AND THE ORDINAND

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

May I offer one further comment on the article of the Dean of King's College, London? Those who are most concerned to stress the importance of experience of life as a preparation for the ministry often seen to make the unquestioned assumption that National Service, generally speaking, widens a man's experience of life, whereas his theological college training always tends in the opposite direction. Certainly it ought to work out that way, so it would seem; but it does not necessarily. It happens not infrequently, my own experience would suggest, that a man enters his theological college, *after* National Service, thoroughly green, naïve and inhibited, with a very narrow understanding of the gospel, and timidly attached to a traditional pious vocabulary utterly remote from the way people think and speak; during his time at college he learns to shed at least some of his naivety and inhibitions, grows into a greater measure of maturity, and begins to ask more searching questions regarding his faith and its expression. This is due in no small measure to his

having lived for two years in very close contact with some forty or so fellow-ordinands, coming from very varied backgrounds, some of them married (with wife and children round and about the college), some of them rather older men with considerable experience of life behind them, and all bound together in the ties of Christian community. If such a community is of healthy growth, both Spirit-filled and warmly human, men living within it can learn a great deal from each other, the green from the ripe, the raw from the mature; there can be a continuing and unself-conscious process of mutual enrichment and correction. The strait-laced can be loosened up, the self-assertive toned down and mellowed; the pretentious can be teased out of their pretentions, the awkward can have some of their rough edges knocked off; the sacerdotally inclined can discover that a man must learn to be a man before he thinks of being a priest. At least these possibilities exist. A man may indeed insulate himself against service life, and also against university life. It is much more difficult for him to insulate himself against the pressures of an intimate and varied Christian community such as a theological college ought to constitute.

Evidently there will always be some men who ought to have some experience of secular life and work as part of their preparation, over and above the training of university and seminary. What I am however trying to suggest is that, in this whole matter, the theological colleges have a vital part to play and a responsibility to fulfil.

Yours faithfully,
THOMAS BAKER.

THE BISHOP'S HOSTEL,
LINCOLN.

PARISH NEWSPAPERS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Since I contributed an article to the December 1956 issue of THEOLOGY on "Parish Newspapers" there has been a development which may be of interest to the ever-increasing number of people who believe that a newspaper is a more effective medium than the parish magazine.

We found that about two-thirds of the matter, i.e. teaching articles, general church and local secular news, that appeared in our paper—the *North End Review*—was as applicable to other parishes in the area as to our own; so we decided to put all the general interest material on the outside four pages and the purely parochial news on the inside page. Extra copies of the outside pages could be run off very cheaply and used by other parishes who put their own page of parochial news inside, printed on the same size and quality paper and in the same type, giving the total paper a unity. Further, to give each paper local appeal, each parish using the outside four pages has

its own heading block put in on the top of page 1. As long as all the heading blocks are the same size, it is a simple matter for the printer to put St X's parish block in when their quota of outside pages is being printed.

If only three or four parishes in a town get together in this way, the outside pages will have a circulation of 10,000—an attractive proposition for advertisers. In fact, with only one-fifth of the paper (a small percentage) devoted to advertisements, the advertising revenue will pay for the setting up of the type and purchase of blocks, which means that parishes can be sold the four outside pages for a 1d–1¼d. each (depending on the quality of paper), which covers the cost of paper and the actual printing. If papers are sold for 3d., this gives parishes nearly 2d. a copy to spend on their own inside page.

This scheme not only solves the problem of how to make the parish newspaper pay its way, but also means that a busy incumbent does not have all the work of producing a four- or six-page paper himself. A paper shared by several parishes also has the advantage that a number of parishes are saying the same thing at the same time, thereby increasing the impact.

Some people are doubtful whether different parishes would be able to agree over editorial policy without drawing the teeth of the paper. God help the Church of England if this is so! In fact, this difficulty seems more imaginary than real, and one of the "highest" and "lowest" parishes in the diocese are in our little scheme.

The contents of the outside four pages are decided by an editorial committee consisting of representatives from each parish in the scheme. It is, of course, necessary to have an editor who executes the committee's instructions, and he can be drawn from a parish with a staff. This is one practical way in which a well-staffed parish can help its less fortunate neighbours.

The scheme now operating in Portsmouth is private enterprise, but it could, of course, be organized on a deanery or diocesan basis.

Nicolas Stacey.

68 Laburnum Grove,
Portsmouth.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Wrath of the Lamb. By A. T. Hanson. S.P.C.K. 25s.

It sometimes befalls a reviewer to be asked to review a book of which he finds that he greatly approves in detail and from which he learns much; yet which seems to him at an early stage of its argument like a ship the compass of which has been deranged by the too close proximity of metal, to have diverged slightly from the straight course that it ought to follow, and so, as it moves onward, to move even further away from the truth. This has been my fate in connexion with *The Wrath of the Lamb.*

Anything produced by either of the Hanson twins, Richard and Anthony, is certain to be marked by wide erudition, careful diligence, a real understanding of what biblical theology is, and some illuminating insights. All these excellent qualities are to be found in this book. Dr Hanson has taken an important subject. In liberal days, the idea of the Wrath was taken to be incurably anthropopathic; now we are beginning to see that it has perhaps a necessary place in our understanding of the purpose of God. The idea of the Wrath is here followed right through the Bible, with careful studies of the Hebrew and Greek words, and with special emphasis on the Apocalypse, a book on which Dr Hanson has contributed commentaries both to the "Torch Series" and to the "Christian Students' Library". Dr Hanson is not afraid to break a lance with such doughty exegetes as Sanday and Headlam, and it seems to me that many of his points are well taken.

So far so good: and now comes my major difficulty. It is neatly summed up in a single sentence on p. 119. A certain scholar "is perhaps making ultimately the same error as those who would see the divine wrath as something in God's mind and not something in man's condition". A large part of Dr Hanson's argument turns on the view that the "Wrath of the Lamb" is to be understood *impersonally*; it is that impersonal world of the law, sin, and death, in which man is in reality himself the cause of his own destruction, and in which the consequences of man's sin work themselves out in logical and implacable sequence. Now in so far as Dr Hanson is fighting the view that "the Wrath" is to be understood only eschatologically, I am with him; beyond that I think that it is he, and not those whom he criticizes, who is in error.

It seems to me that he has been misled by certain linguistic usages in later Hebrew. It is perfectly true that in the later books of the Old Testament there is a marked tendency, which is even more marked in the later Judaism, to speak of God in impersonal terms (e.g. 2 Chron. 19. 10, "and so wrath came upon you"; p. 22); but this was due simply to a deep sense of reverence for, and reserve in the way of speaking of, a God who was still regarded as being in every way personal. It is also true that we meet in Philo a combination of this tendency with that other derived from Greek thought, which attributed to God *apatheia*, and made it difficult to ascribe to him any *pathos*. Anyone who was worked in this connexion on the Fathers of the fourth century knows well the straits to which they are reduced in their attempts to be simultaneously biblical and loyal to the Greek tradition in which they had been brought up. But all this does not seem to me to add up as a basis for the idea of an "impersonal wrath" of God or of the Lamb in either Old or New Testament.

I would perhaps have hesitated to express so definite a view had I not found myself supported by the other outstanding study of the subject in recent years, the gigantic article of no less than fifty pages on ὀργή in Vol. V of Kittel's *Wörterbuch*. The important thing about this article is that the N.T. section is by Professor G. Stählin of

Mainz. Stählin seems to me to stand, with Bultmann, head and shoulders above most of the contributors to Kittel in recent years. He has a good knowledge of classical Greek, and an instinctive understanding of N.T. words; and he shares with Hanson and myself the great advantage of having been for some years a missionary in India. Hanson lists this article in his extensive bibliography, but I fancy that it appeared after the greater part of his studies had been completed. As the article has not been translated, I may venture to lengthen my review a little by including three short passages:

> "It can be shown that in no passage in the New Testament is the wrath of God a principle which works independently of God, but that everywhere it is in the closest relationship to God, and to the God whose personal reactions are manifest therein. The words τοῦ Θεοῦ are often not expressed; . . . but the absolute use of ὀργή is comparable to the similar use of χάρις in Paul and his successors." (Op. cit., p. 424. Stählin might have added the remarkable absolute use of θέλημα in 1 Cor. 16. 12, which is misunderstood by so many expositors.)
>
> "A wrath of God as an irrational *mysterium tremendum* is not to be found in the picture the New Testament presents either of God or of Jesus Christ; in all such passages, what we have to do with is the holy wrath of Jesus and his Father" (op. cit., p. 424, n. 197).
>
> It is true that the verb ὀργίζομαι is not used of God in the N.T.: "but we cannot avoid asking the question—when the word ὀργή is used of God, does it imply an emotional state (*Affekt*) in God? . . . It is true that in the majority of passages in the New Testament wrath is actually *the effect of wrath, the consequences of wrath, the wrathful judgment*; but the idea of an actual condition within God himself cannot be excluded in the interpretation of a number of New Testament passages, any more than this is possible in the case of ἀγάπη or ἔλεος . . . . As in the Old Testament, so also in the New, ὀργή is both—God's hatred of evil, his 'passionate' hostility to every will that sets itself up against the will of God, and also the action that as judge he takes against evil" (op. cit., p. 425).

To explain in detail why I stand with Stählin and not with Hanson would involve me in writing a book as large and as careful as *The Wrath of the Lamb*. This is a book that demands to be read carefully and pondered, and only when he comes to the last page will the careful reader be able to decide whether the verdict is for or against the view that Hanson has so ably and ingeniously maintained.

S. C. Neill.

Geneva.

The Acts of the Apostles. By C. S. C. Williams. A. and C. Black. 25s.

Mr Williams' commentary is published at the same price as Professor F. F. Bruce's (1951) and is intended for the same class of readers; and many students may now wonder which of the two they should buy. Bruce printed the Greek text and gave us sixty pages of introduction and 400 pages of commentary, especially detailed in matters of text and language, conservative in outlook, precise in its judgments. Williams, in a well-produced volume of less than 300

pages, provides an English translation of his own, fifty pages of introduction which carefully summarizes the evidence of both sides of the controversial issues, and a commentary without footnotes but with full references to the abundant literature, including (an advantage here over Professor Bruce) that relating to the Qumran scrolls.

Mr Williams, though far more willing than Professor Bruce to let the reader make up his own mind, allows his views to be known. It seems clear in the end that he holds St Luke to have been the author of the whole book, which, he believes, was written after a first draft of the third gospel soon after 64 and well before the publication of the *Antiquities* of Josephus, or, conceivably, about 85 and after the Aramaic version of the *Jewish War*. On the enigmatic conclusion to Acts, "the present writer is not convinced that . . . Luke would not have recorded Paul's release had he known it". On the relationship with Galatians, etc., "there seems no good reason to withhold a verdict that the alleged discrepancies between the Pauline epistles and Acts are not so grave as to compel the decision that Acts could not have been written by a companion of St Paul". On the speeches, he is against Dibelius and Mr C. F. Evans. The "Western" text of Acts, "which is characterized by additions, may have been the result of a 'publication' of the text in the first half of the second century; this may have incorporated harmonizing details and 'gossip' to attract the lay reader becoming familiar with the Apocryphal Gospels". Mr Williams indicates his evaluation of the historical worth of Acts by an occasional exclamation mark after citing a piece from the *Beginnings of Christianity* and by such comments as this (on St Paul's conversion): "Jung's thesis is illuminating but quite incapable of proof, and his whole treatment of the subject eliminates the supernatural." There is a useful warning (on pp. 152 f., not 162 f. as index) to those who wrest types of Peter, Cornelius and Herod out of Jonah, the Gentiles and the king of Nineveh.

The new commentary is, in short, learned, wise and balanced; it has been written after many years of experience at Merton College of what theological students require; and it will be widely and gratefully used. The reviewer has but two reservations: he is not quite sure about the helpfulness of the translation, which is both literal and archaic ("But it came to pass on the morrow that their rulers and elders and scribes were brought together in Jerusalem, both Annas the high-priest and Caiaphas and John and Alexander and as many as were of high-priestly stock. And having set them in the midst they began to inquire, By what power or by what name did you do this?"), and he would recommend the use of an adequate Bible atlas in place of the map provided here in front of the index, which does not show all the places mentioned in the book and which in one case adopts a different spelling.

On p. 283 Mr Williams has conflated (from memory?) several sentences from p. 369 of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, but the "wheel of Fate" introduces a notion not present in Schweitzer. And the well-known quip that "Marcion was the first to understand St Paul and he misunderstood him" is attributed to Harnack (p. 23),

but according to Schweitzer (*The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, p. 38, n.) it was spoken by Franz Overbeck *to* Harnack.

Wilfrid Browning.

Cuddesdon College.

Nature into History. By Leslie Paul. Faber and Faber. 21s.

Pre-historic Religion. By E. O. James. Thames and Hudson. 30s.

Buddhist and Christian Mysticism. By D. T. Suzuki. (In "World Perspectives".) George Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d.

It is rather hard to group these three books together, except in so far as they all belong to the section known as "The History and Comparative Study of Religion"—or Religions? Mr Paul and Dr James, however, cover some of the same ground, since they try to elucidate the condition which might perhaps be called "Proto-religion". Mr Paul is concerned with the transition from anthropoid to man, and what it involves; and especially with "historical awareness" as something which, however feebly it may operate—perhaps at maximum over a span of two or three generations backward or forward—is always different from the awareness of mammals, and still more of insects. Even man's forgetfulness is different from sub-human forgetfulness. Man in his family and personal life belongs plainly in one sphere of his being to the natural cycle, and in another sphere to "the linear voyage of the spirit". What has happened to him? Why do the apes remain in this natural cyclical life, in spite of all that Köhler can show, and seem as though they must continue in it to the end of time, while man has moved out of it?

This is the problem discussed by Mr Paul in his eight chapters, and it is an exceedingly interesting and ably conducted discussion. The conclusion to which he comes is, he admits, one which might almost be taken to mean the acceptance of "special creation". He does not deny all evolution, but rejects the possibility of any answer at all to the problem of transition from the anthropoid to the human, on the physiological plane, and posits only a tentative answer on the cultural level. This transition is thus seen to be like one of Professor Lloyd Morgan's "emergents"—something which could not be predicated from what had gone before. Part of this cultural transition Mr Paul sees as the renunciation of incest, in which he considers it reasonable to assume that the moral sense of man was born. The development of the sense of the sacred also belongs to this cultural transition, since in a multitude of grotesque forms it distinguishes the poorest and most wretched of surviving primitive savages from sub-human creations around them. The growth of a sense of this particular element is developed in detail by Dr James in his book, which forms an elaborate kind of commentary on Mr Paul's sixth chapter. Mr Paul then goes on to discuss the origins of human speech as distinct from animal noises. Here perhaps Dr Ludwig Koch

would say that it was possible to exaggerate the distinction, and that in his recordings he had been able to detect the elements of bird and mammalian speech, and in this of course he would have had the support of Darwin. Mr Paul, however, considers that there must be some fundamental reason why the sounds made by sub-human creatures have never shown any signs of evolving into even the most primitive sort of human speech. Sub-man could not, he holds, have reached the stature of man except in society, and society could not have done this for him without language. It looks, therefore, as though in some kind of "evolutionary explosion", man, society, and language emerged simultaneously or concurrently. But this, of course, can only be surmise. In any case, however, the conclusion is inescapable that language is bound up with the step from the cyclical natural to the linear historical, since without articulate language, whether written or spoken does not matter at this point, there could be no communication by man of his experiences to his fellows, and no sharing of the meaning of those experiences. Mr Paul falls back in the end on a series of quotations from other writers, about man's almost unwilling ascent towards spiritual consciousness, and especially on Berdyaev's epigram: "It is not man who is human but God. It is God who requires of man that he should be human." Man would often like to slip back into the condition of not being human; and Mr Paul considers that the cultural transition may thus have occurred almost as the result of a *command* proceeding from the Divine.

Dr James differs greatly from Mr Paul in his treatment of this theme. Avoiding speculation, he brings together in a careful and scholarly manner the vast mass of material which has been collected, especially in the last few years since the earlier text-books were written. Rather a large space is devoted to the disposal and cultus of the human dead, more perhaps than some would think justified. There is a deliberate refusal to separate off the prehistoric from the proto-historic data. In the final chapter pre-history and proto-history are made to flow into each other; but attention is concentrated upon the periods in which no written records obtain, although use is also made of material still, or until recently, existing in primitive societies on the fringes of civilization. Here, again, the chief value of this book lies in its bringing us up to date with the various new discoveries made by field-workers in anthropology.

Dr Suzuki's work deals with an entirely different field, and does not follow at all the plan adopted by the writer of the first volume in this particular series, Dr Fred Hoyle, i.e. that of a compact and ordered argument. It is in point of fact not planned at all; but is merely a short collection of miscellaneous essays written by the author on various occasions during the course of his duties, and dealing, sometimes rather superficially, with what he conceives to be the similarities and contrasts between Christianity and Buddhism. It is not clear why some sections are called "appendices". The section on transmigration is really an essay in itself.

The only substantial comparative contribution is Essay I, on

Meister Eckehart, and some of this overflows into Essay II, and has been discussed before by Dr Rudolf Otto in his work *West-östliche Mystik*, subsequently translated into English. As so often happens, someone has been allowed to write an unwise blurb, telling readers in advance that Dr Suzuki is the unchallenged master of his subject, and that this is one of the most important works to appear for a considerable time. What a pity that readers cannot be left to find this out for themselves! Suzuki admittedly knows the writings of his fellow-Japanese mystics intimately, and it is good that he should introduce us to them; but his understanding of Christianity is at times very thin. Everyone realizes that Eckehart was a most unusual and unorthodox Christian, but it is difficult to agree with Suzuki's quotation from Ananda Coomaraswamy, that what is proved by analogies is not the influence of one system of thought upon another, but the coherence of the metaphysical tradition in the world. One can see no reason for doubting that Oriental factors *did* pass through the medieval monastic orders from one country to another. The possibility was recognized long ago by Milman in writing his *History of Latin Christianity*; and more recently it has been shown how art-forms passed from the non-Christian Middle East into the Egyptian monasteries, thence into Byzantine monasteries, and thence into those of Central and Western Europe. I don't believe, for myself, that Eckehart was as independent of factors of this kind as some would have us believe. The influence of pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite can be detected in him as in other medieval mystics, and, as Bishop Westcott pointed out long ago, this influence is not by any means strictly Christian, but rather neo-Platonic, with distinct affinities for Indian thought.

Nevertheless, one cannot help agreeing in a measure with Dr Suzuki that *some* Christian experiences are not after all different from those of the Buddhist, and that it is terminology which divides us—not, I would say, "always" but "sometimes". But while there is much to be said for learning to elucidate one another's terms, Suzuki, who, one understands, is now in New York, is mistaken in stressing "a movement among Christians to denude their religion of its unnecessary historical appendix". If such a movement exists anywhere, it is not likely to find support among any substantial body of Christians who really know what their religion is about: nor is it correct to describe the historical basis of the Christian faith as "all sorts of mythological paraphernalia".

Nevertheless, it is a good thing that earnest scholars like Dr Suzuki should continue to arise in our midst, since there has been all too little serious conversation between Buddhists and Christians, and in consequence much prejudice and many misunderstandings have arisen.

A. C. Bouquet.

Cambridge.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE BOOK OF THE LAW. Studies in the date of Deuteronomy. By G. T. Manley. Tyndale Press. 12s. 6d.

A PATH THROUGH GENESIS. By Bruce Vawter, C.M. Sheed and Ward. 18s.

Mr Manley's learned and detailed study of the date of Deuteronomy depends upon two assumptions. One is that the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis is now "giving way". This apparently means not merely that any hypothesis which is to do justice to the full range of the facts is likely to be much more complicated, but that the basic principle is being repudiated. Anyone who cares to re-read the most competent survey of Pentateuchal criticism in recent years, that by Professor C. R. North in *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (ed. H. H. Rowley, 1951)—who does indeed say (p. 81), "as matters now stand, the history of any one of the 'documents' may well be as complicated as the history of the whole Pentateuch was conceived to be only thirty years ago"—will receive a different impression. And though the author is honest enough to say of contemporary scholarship, "the dating of Deuteronomy may be anything between the lifetime of Moses and the return from exile" (p. 22), he himself believes that he has given detailed reasons for "taking seriously the claims which the book makes for itself, that the law was declared by Moses at a given time and place". And though he knows that many will draw back at this point, he thinks that "if Christ is risen, all the miracles of the Old Testament as well as the New, range themselves round this miracle" (pp. 179–80). The religious and intellectual grasp of this book cannot compare with that of S. R. Driver, whose main conclusions it sets aside.

The exposition of the book of Genesis by an American Roman Catholic deserves a warm welcome, because it should be a stimulus to both the mind and the faith of any Christian who reads it. The standpoint from which he writes ("*What the author intended to teach* is the meaning of Genesis; this is the word of God which is free from error. We can say, therefore, that while Genesis undoubtedly contains errors, it teaches none") is not as theologically satisfying as that of Professor Leonard Hodgson, who in the second volume of his Gifford Lectures has been teaching us to think of the Bible "not as having ultimate authority in and of itself, but as being an organ through which the living God may reveal himself to us". But, even so, it is quite clear that it is a standpoint that enables both author and reader to be at one and the same time honest and believing. A devout expositor who says at the beginning of his introduction "that the Semitic mentality differs from the Anglo-Saxon may be a pity, but differ it does" (p. 24) promises well; and the whole of his exposition will be found interesting, understandable and helpful to the Christian reader.

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

BRADFORD.

Changing Industrial Relations. By Sir Wilfred Garrett. S.P.C.K. 2s.

In this lecture, Sir Wilfred Garrett describes the changes that have taken place in industrial relations during his fifty years with the Factory Department. The astonishing improvements not only in conditions but also in the relations between capital and labour, have been brought about by four main influences—the work of voluntary societies which crystallized in the foundation of the Institute of Personal Management, pioneer firms, the trade unions and legislation. The two sides of industry remain and strike hard bargains, but it is now recognized that the Joint Industrial Council is the proper machinery for bargaining rather than strikes and lockouts. Sir Wilfred has much to say about strikes and responsibility.

It was only when he went abroad that he realized the strength of the Christian tradition that remains in Britain. If that tradition is to be maintained, as he believes it must, the Church must think out means of bridging the gulf that exists between itself and the workers. How right Sir Wilfred is in thinking that at first, at any rate, this must take the form of self-criticism rather than criticism of industry!

Helena Charles.

London.

The Temple of Jerusalem. By André Parrot. Translated by B. E. Hooke. S.C.M. Press. 9s. 6d.

The importance of an acquaintance with the design and function of the Temple has become increasingly apparent to all readers of the Bible in recent years, particularly in connexion with the study of the Psalter. The Howland-Garber filmstrip *The Temple of Solomon* (South-eastern Films, Atlanta), with its first-class script, is of inestimable value in this respect, and is now issued in Britain (with less useful scripts) by Carwal, Ltd. Now M. Parrot has added to his *Studies in Biblical Archaeology* a compact and very useful summary of the known facts relating to the three successive Temples. It is accurate and informed, and includes a useful bibliography; but a brief discussion of the kind of worship which the Temple housed, though more controversial, would have stimulated the average reader's imagination. In particular, it seems a pity to illustrate the post-exilic imaginary arrangement of ark and cherubim (Fig. IX) rather than the Solomonic arrangement, and the relevant paragraph is also confusing. The illustrations are otherwise clear and well chosen. The translation reads smoothly and is unobtrusive.

S. B. Frost.

McGill University,
Montreal.

Sermons on Isaiah's Prophecy of the Death and Passion of Christ. By John Calvin. Translated and edited by T. H. L. Parker. James Clarke and Co. 12s. 6d.

This volume of sermons contains an introduction by the editor and before each fairly long sermon a page or two from Calvin's own Commentary on Isaiah. They are very scriptural and take the form of exposition of words and phrases rather than discourses built on a set structure. Also, considering the time when they were delivered, there is very little anti-Roman material. It is somewhat surprising to find that there are few quotations from the Fathers, although Calvin was a great patristic scholar.

Phrases which deserve meditation appear. For example, remarks that God uses such strange means of raising up the Redeemer; chastisement, Calvin says, means reconciliation; and, again, "in ourselves we are scattered: in Christ we are gathered together".

The dominant theme of the sermons may be said to be a theology of the atonement. Calvin mentions the depravity of man, but there is no idea of bargaining; rather the love of God and the divine initiative are stressed. The idea of our incorporation into Christ is also brought forward; Christ "must receive us and so unite us with himself that we might have by adoption what he alone has by nature" (p. 114).

A good summary might be to say that the whole passage is treated in a very Christocentric manner.

H. F. Woodhouse.

Vancouver.

Letters of John Henry Newman. Edited by Derek Stanford and Muriel Spark. Peter Owen. 25s.

John Henry Newman: Autobiographical Writings. Edited by Henry Tristram. Sheed and Ward. 18s.

The former of these volumes is a pleasantly contrived introduction to the life and personality of Newman, consisting of a selection from his letters. Mr Stanford edits the Anglican section, and Miss Spark the Roman Catholic. As a way of making Newman's acquaintance, this offers a good alternative to reading the *Apologia*.

The *Autobiographical Writings* is a book for more advanced students of Newman. It contains all the autobiographical material which he left in his room when he died. Much of it has appeared in print before, either in Anne Mozley's *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. N.* or in the *Life* by Wilfrid Ward. But this is the first complete edition, to which reference will always have to be made in future. It is furnished with admirable introductory notes by the late Fr Tristram. For instance, there is a most interesting account of the circumstances in which Anne Mozley's work was produced. It is also worth remarking that we are provided with 350 pages for 18s., whereas in the former case we get only 250 pages for 25s.

A. R. V.

WORDS AND IMAGES: A STUDY IN THEOLOGICAL DISCOURSE. By E. L. Mascall. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

CHRISTIAN COMMENT: AN APOLOGETIC. By E. J. Carnell. Macmillan, New York. $5.00.

Dr Mascall has written a useful tract for the times, which fulfils a double purpose. By means of careful summary and extensive quotation he gives his readers a good account of the approach of some of the more radical English philosophers of the linguistic school to the possibilities and problems of theological knowledge. In particular he is concerned with Ayer's concept of verification, the discussion on theology and falsification initiated by Wisdom and Flew, and Braithwaite's analysis of religious belief in terms of agapeistic behaviour. But Dr Mascall also makes his own contribution to these discussions, and his comments and criticisms are often shrewd and to the point. Two points of general application are worthy of note. He insists that all these discussions on the meaningfulness of theological language are not as new as they are sometimes made to appear. The same issues, he claims, were at stake in the development of the medieval doctrine of analogy. Secondly, he continually insists that his primary disagreement with the linguistic philosophers lies in the basic realm of epistemology. A strictly empiricist epistemology, which operates only in terms of sense data and logical constructs from them, is unlikely to lead to faith in a transcendent God. Those who have taken part in actual discussions with philosophers of this school will agree that Dr Mascall is here laying his finger on a point of fundamental importance. The positive exposition of his own ideas on these subjects is brief and unsystematic, though it contains many good and suggestive points. But this is only to say that the book fulfils the restricted role that the author has assigned to it. It is not intended as a systematic treatise on theological language and epistemology, but rather as a stimulating contribution to a particular debate. This limited goal, with the aid of its clarity and incisiveness, it undoubtedly achieves. Those who are attracted to its purchase by its striking dust cover should not be disappointed.

Dr Carnell's book is conceived very much more in the grand manner. Scientific method, he declares in his preface, clarifies our physical environment and philosophical method our rational environment, but no method has yet been developed to clarify our moral and spiritual environment. It is this stupendous gap that Dr Carnell (Professor of Apologetics at an American Baptist seminary) sets out to fulfil. His intentions are excellent—if rather self-consciously so ("The noble desire to guide others is my first motive in writing", p. 3). His starting-point is sound—the moral and spiritual environment cannot be properly understood by detached observation from outside. Hence his aim is to develop what he calls the third method of knowing or knowledge by moral self-acceptance. The execution of these good intentions, however, leaves much to be desired. The pseudo-scientific language which he employs gives a false air of cogency and precision in a sphere of thought where such

precision ought not to be expected. The arguments used frequently assume what they want to prove, and knowledge by moral self-acceptance easily can and sometimes does degenerate into a substitute for reasoning. Opposing points of view are dismissed as "merely showing a want of education". The style is chatty, hortatory and repetitive. We are reminded at times of Kierkegaard without the irony. But Kierkegaard, for all his greatness, is not a wise model.

MAURICE WILES.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
IBADAN.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

BLACKFRIARS PUBLICATIONS: J. G. Arintero, O.P., *Stages in Prayer* (12s.).

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: Maxence van der Meersch, *Fishers of Men* [a novel] (5s. 6d.); Leo Trese, *Wisdom shall Enter* (10s. 6d.); Vincent Buckley (Ed.), *The Incarnation in the University* (7s. 6d.).

CLARENDON PRESS: Hamilton Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Sardica* A.D. 343 (25s.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: F. D. Maurice, *Theological Essays* [new edition] (15s.)

FAITH PRESS: Stephen F. Bayne, Jr., *In the sight of the Lord* [Meditations for Lent by the Bishop of Olympia] (6s. paper; 9s. 6d. cloth).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: H. Harold Kent, *An Architect Preaches* [sermons] (10s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: T. T. Carter (Ed.), *The Treasury of Devotion* [new edition, revised by Dom Robert Petitpierre] (8s. 6d.).

MACMILLAN: Geddes MacGregor, *The Vatican Revolution* (21s.); Vincent Taylor, *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching* (21s.).

MARSHALL, MORGAN AND SCOTT: Richard Glover, *A Teacher's Commentary on St Mark* [intended for lay preachers and Sunday school workers] (17s. 6d.); R. K. Harrison, *A History of Old Testament Times* (17s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: Austin Pardue, *The Single Eye* (5s.); Kenneth N. Ross, *The Thirty-nine Articles* (5s.); Lev Gillet, *A Day with our Lord* [meditation for a retreat] (1s. 6d.); Bossuet, *Letters of Spiritual Direction* (5s.).

NISBET: Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology* (Vol. II), (25s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Guy Mayfield, *The Church of England: Its Members and its Business* (18s.).

PENGUIN BOOKS: Geoffrey Parrinder, *Witchcraft* (3s. 6d.).

RUNA PRESS: Jonathan Hanaghan, *Society, Evolution and Revelation* (21s.).

ST ANDREW PRESS: G. D. Henderson, *The Burning Bush* (30s.).

ST ANTHONY'S PRESS: Anne Ashley, *The Church in the Isle of Man* (3s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Olive Wyon, *On the Way* (8s. 6d); Krister Stendahl (Ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (35s.); John V. Taylor, *Processes of Growth in an African Church* (3s.); William Nicholls, *Revelation in Christ* (15s.); A. M. Hunter, *Introducing New Testament Theology* (10s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: G. E. Phillips, *The Imagery of the Pilgrim Psalms* (1s. 9d.); K. A. Saunders, *Christening your Child* (1s.); Anne Z. Forsythe, *A Little Book of Hours for Housewives* (1s. 6d.); Eric G. Jay, *Christ Died for Us* (1s.); K. A. Saunders, *On Marrying in Church* (1s.).

UNIVERSITY OF WALES PRESS: H. P. Owen, *Revelation and Existence: a study in the Theology of R. Bultmann* (15s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

LAMBETH YEAR 1958

International Summer Courses

AT

ST. AUGUSTINE'S, CANTERBURY

The Central College of the Anglican Communion

July 14—26 THE CHURCH AND THE LAITY
July 28—Aug. 9 THE CHURCH AND SOCIETY
Aug. 11—23 LAMBETH AND CHRISTIAN UNITY

Lecturers include: THE BISHOPS OF DERBY, KNARESBOROUGH, OLYMPIA (U.S.A.) and KURUNAGALA (Ceylon), CANON E. SOUTHCOTT (Halton), PROFESSORS R. H. FULLER (Evanston) and C. A. SIMPSON (Oxford), MR. PHILIP MAIRET (London), DR. MORAN WESTON (New York), and DR. H. H. WALZ (Germany).

Full details from:
The Secretary of the Summer Courses, St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, Kent

PREACHING THE CROSS

J. C. Fenton **7s. 6d. net**

A theological examination of the Marcon Passion narrative, with special reference to Christ's Words from the Cross. The substance of lectures given at St Boniface, College, Warminster.

GO IN PEACE

Manasses **5s. 6d.**

" Those who have to deal with the problems of sin in individual lives will find this book invaluable."—*Oxford Diocesan Magazine.*

S · P · C · K

New Seraph Books

MEDITATION AND MENTAL PRAYER

WILFRID L. KNOX **3s. 6d.**

A simple introduction, in non-technical language, to the practice of Mental and Affective Prayer, by the late Canon Wilfrid Knox. This book, originally published in 1927, proved so popular that it is now reprinted as a Seraph Book. The Dean of York contributes a short introduction.

CHRISTIAN BELIEF

R. H. MALDEN **3s. 6d.**

This book (first published in 1942) is a brilliantly lucid exposition of the fundamental Christian beliefs, combining simplicity with mature scholarship. An ideal book for anyone who wants to grasp the essentials of Christian belief, and also suitable for study groups.

CHRIST OUR HOPE

PIERSON PARKER **5s.**

Dr Pierson Parker, who is a Professor in the General Theological Seminary of New York, interprets for the layman the basic ideas of the New Testament. The result is a readable and illuminating study of the New Testament which students and laymen alike will read to their profit.

Because students will need the book in more durable form than a paper-back, there is an edition in cloth-boards, *12s. 6d.* net.

A RELIGION FOR MONDAY MORNING

K. E. MACLEAN **4s. 0d.**

A very popular and colourful summary of Christian belief and practice, relating the whole of religion to the ordinary concerns of everyday life.

To be published in March.

THE KIRKBRIDE CONVERSATIONS

HARRY BLAMIRES **4s. 6d.**

Canon Kirkbride, a scholarly and thoroughly human parish priest, discusses problems of Christian belief with a young agnostic schoolmaster, a typical twentieth century unbeliever. The conversations take place within a setting of characters and situations which give this book all the fascination of a novel.

To be published in March.

THE TRUTH OF RELIGION

J. B. WILSON **4s. 6d.**

John B. Wilson, a master at King's School, Canterbury, meets the contemporary philosophical attack on religion by turning its own weapons against it. Here is an acute logical analysis of basic religious truths, addressed to the thoughtful layman and six-former. Mr Wilson does not here urge for specifically Christian beliefs but those fundamental positions on which specific belief is built. *To be published in March.*

S · P · C · K